

Appl. No. 09/927,255
Response Dated December 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are presently pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 23, 25, and 27 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,226,675 to Meltzer et al. ("Meltzer"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection.

While Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection presented in the Office Action, Applicant has amended the independent claims in order to expedite prosecution on the merits.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "a document parser to parse said document and create a document object from said transaction information" and "a pattern parser to parse the pattern information for one or more elements according to a predefined pattern object data structure and to place said elements in appropriate blocks within said pattern object data structure." Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 13, 23, 25, and 27.

With respect to amended claims 1, 13, 23, 25, and 27, Meltzer clearly fails to teach, among other things, both a document parser to parse a document to create a document object and a pattern parser to parse pattern information for one or more elements according to a predefined pattern object data structure and to place the elements

Appl. No. 09/927,255
Response Dated December 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005

in appropriate blocks within the pattern object data structure. Consequently, each of claims 1, 13, 23, 25, and 27 recites a combination of features which is neither taught nor suggested by Meltzer. Applicant reminds the Examiner that in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See* MPEP § 2131, for example.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.


For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 13, 23, 25, and 27 are allowable and that dependent claims 2-12, 14-22, 24, 26, and 28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable independent claims, as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-28.

Appl. No. 09/927,255
Response Dated December 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9344 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC


Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: December 21, 2005

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on December 21, 2005.


Deborah L. Higham

12/21/05
Date